

10-12-90  
12.3.8v.5

ASH GROVE CEMENT WEST, INC.

SEATTLE, WA 98134  
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: October 12, 1990

To: Steve Rinella

From: Nate Fernow *Nate*

Copies to: Dick Cooke

Subject: Seattle Dry Well Proposal

Ken Rone ✓

=====

This overall design looks like a very plausible way to handle the site drainage.

Here are some of my thoughts on the package:

Klein letter of 10/3/90, Page 6; Is the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph a reference to the drain lines themselves? The perforated pipe should have little or no buoyant forces if there are holes at low points along their length.

*I thought don't call*

Klein letter, Figure 2; If the top of outlet pipe from the manhole is set lower than the 6.5' elevation of the inlet to the header assembly this structure could also act as an oil / debris trap. (This assumes the structure is not also made of perforated pipe.) The "weephole" would have to be eliminated and a pump used for fully emptying the manhole.

*show*

Klein letter, Page 8; Item G. is unclear.

*3 ap-  
plies  
to a well  
down*

SM&G Figure 1, Settling Basin; What is the function of the 5 - 8" openings in the decant basin wall?

*no  
yes*

The outlet line to the dry well will require a siphon break vent to function as an oil separator. Siphoning would occur during initial fill when the manhole downstream has drained via the "weephole". This line should also be valved to prevent water ingress from the plant drainage system any time a person may be inspecting the dry well.

Provisions should be considered for pH control at the settling basin. WDOE will still be concerned with the release of high pH waters. This could simply be another basin between the inlet / decant and outlet that could be fitted with the necessary circulating and treatment equipment.

Please call if any of these items require further explanation.

USEPA SF

AGC2H000113



1261579